

Grisedale Croft Care Home, Alston

Written submission on the conduct of the consultation, on the report now before the Committee, and on the future of care on Alston Moor

Health and Adults Scrutiny Committee, Westmorland and Furness Council · Meeting of Wednesday 23 September 2026 · Agenda item 6 · Submitted 18 September 2026

IN ONE MINUTE

- ▶ **The first page states as settled fact the three propositions the consultation existed to test** — then the same page says the report "does not attempt to determine the accuracy" of any claim, including the authority's own.
- ▶ **On corrected information, refurbishment won.** In the only phase where consultees knew what they were being asked, refurbishment led alternative accommodation by 66 responses to 58. The report nowhere says so.
- ▶ **Among Alston Moor's own residents, keeping care on the Grisedale Croft site led the preferred option by 87 to 82** — on the authority's own Table 7. The report does not say this either.
- ▶ **The same authority, at the same Cabinet meeting, named a preferred option for Alston Moor and expressly did not for Windermere.** The Applethwaite Green consultation ran on four options with no preference stated. Ours ran on five with the answer marked in advance.
- ▶ **The £2.5m-£3.0m refurbishment estimate appears in the Applethwaite Green report as well** — the same figure for a different building fifty miles away. The authority holds no survey of either.
- ▶ **There is not one pound sign in fifty-nine pages.** No occupancy figure, no cost, no referral data — although the report names these as the most contested evidence of all.
- ▶ **The sentence recording drop-in attendance is word-for-word identical in both reports.** It cannot be a record of what happened in either place.
- ▶ **Officers took notes at the drop-in sessions, and people were told their views would be included.** No note has been produced, nothing from the sessions is in the report, and a report promised to the Parish Clerk never arrived.
- ▶ **One response in 199 supported closure,** and the authority's own consultation page still says Alston has "little alternative provision available".

This submission is made on behalf of Alston Moor Parish Council. It sets out why we do not believe the consultation on the future of Grisedale Croft Care Home has met the standards the law requires, why we do not believe the report now before this Committee is a sound basis for the advice it will give to Cabinet, and what we say should happen instead.

Every point in Parts A to E is drawn from Westmorland and Furness Council's own published documents. Where we give a figure, it is the authority's own figure, and where we say a table does not add up, we have added the columns. A list of sources appears at the end. References are of three kinds: **pack page** is the number at the foot of the reports pack for this meeting; **report page** is the number inside the attached Grisedale Croft Consultation Report; **Applethwaite report page** is the number inside the Applethwaite Green Consultation Report behind agenda item 7.

Part F sets out separately, and as questions rather than as assertions, matters on which we hold accounts that we have not been able to document from the authority's papers. We have deliberately kept them out of the body of this submission.

THE TEST BEING APPLIED

A lawful consultation must satisfy the four Gunning principles. It must be undertaken while the proposal is still at a formative stage; it must give consultees enough information to respond intelligently; it must allow adequate time; and the product of the consultation must be conscientiously taken into account before any decision is reached. The covering report acknowledges these principles at paragraph 7.1, at pack page 6. We say the consultation falls short of each of them, and that the report now before you compounds that difficulty rather than curing it.

PART A

The report before the Committee is not an accurate or complete record

1 The first page states as fact the very propositions the consultation existed to test

The report opens, at report page 3, by setting out the three challenges said to face Grisedale Croft:

"buildings with layouts and room sizes that no longer meet modern care and regulatory standards, and which are costly to run and maintain; declining occupancy rates, leading to very high costs per person; workforce pressures, with difficulty recruiting staff and high spending on agency staff."

Each of those three was challenged throughout the consultation, by this Parish Council and by others, on the strength of the authority's own disclosures under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The report records those challenges at Themes 6, 7, 8 and 9. It resolves none of them. Four paragraphs below the three propositions, on the same page, it states:

"It does not attempt to determine the accuracy of claims made by respondents, campaign groups, public bodies or the council itself."

WHY THE ORDER MATTERS

The three founding assumptions appear as settled fact in the opening paragraphs of the document Cabinet will read. The evidence disputing them is confined to thematic summaries which the report expressly declines to adjudicate. A reader who reads only the introduction and the executive summary — which is how most decision papers are read — will take the premises as established and the objections as opinion. **That is not neutrality. It is a presumption in favour of one side, written into the structure of the document.**

Two further points follow. First, the same three bullet points appear word for word in the Applethwaite Green report at Applethwaite report page 3. They are not findings about Grisedale Croft; they are a template applied to two different buildings in two different communities. Second, if determining accuracy is not the task of this report, the Committee is entitled to ask whose task it is, and when it is to be done, given that Cabinet is due to decide on 13 October.

We note in passing that the same introduction records that the service "continues to deliver high-quality care and is rated 'Good' by the Care Quality Commission".

2 The covering report gives a closing date the consultation never had

Paragraph 3.2 of the covering report, at pack page 5, states:

"The consultation ran from 14th May 2026 – 19th July 2026."

That is wrong, and it is wrong twice over. The consultation closed on **19 August 2026** — the attached report says so at report pages 3, 6 and 12, and the authority's live consultation page describes "the 14-week public consultations". It was originally advertised to close on **5 August 2026**, as report page 6 records. **19 July was never the closing date at any point in this consultation.** It is not the corrected date and it is not the original date. The identical error appears at paragraph 3.2 of the Applethwaite Green covering report, at pack page 65.

WHY THIS MATTERS BEYOND ACCURACY

The closing date moved to 19 August because Westmorland and Furness Council accepted in June that its own consultation materials had not made clear that refurbishment and rebuild would each require the home to close for between twelve and twenty-four months, with residents moved out. **The one date the covering report gets wrong is the date that exists because the authority got the information wrong the first time.** A member reading only the covering report would not know that the extension happened, or why it was needed — and would not know that the phase which produced the opposite answer is the phase the wrong date erases.

3 The finding the report does not state: on corrected information, refurbishment led

Table 5, at report page 16, divides the responses into the two phases of the consultation. Part 2 is the only phase in which consultees had the corrected information.

Option	Part 1 — old information	Part 2 — corrected information	Total
2 — Refurbish	14 (23%)	66 (48%)	80 (40%)
5 — New provision	37 (61%)	58 (42%)	95 (48%)
1 — Do nothing	4 (7%)	2 (1%)	6 (3%)
3 — Rebuild	1 (2%)	5 (4%)	6 (3%)
4 — Close	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	1 (0.5%)
Other	5 (8%)	6 (4%)	11 (5.5%)
Total	61	138	199

Among the people who knew what they were being asked, refurbishment was the most supported option. **The report does not say so anywhere.** Its executive summary, at report page 4, states instead that "Option 5 ... was the most selected option overall", and describes what happened only as support having "reduced" and "increased".

Taken more widely, the three options that keep care provision on the Grisedale Croft site — do nothing, refurbish, and demolish and rebuild there — account for **73 of the 138 informed responses, against 58 for the preferred option.**

Option 5 leads in the overall total only because that total includes 61 Part 1 responses given on information the authority accepts was incomplete. The authority's own figures, in Tables 3 and 4 at report pages 15 and 16, show how few of those 61 were meaningfully re-engaged: 45 were emailed, 8 spoken to by telephone, 6 written to, and 2 could not be contacted. The report records that **exactly one** of the 61 submitted an updated response — and did not change preference — and that five of the eight telephoned confirmed the new information made no difference.

A QUESTION THE COMMITTEE SHOULD ASK

Table 4 records that 33 Part 1 paper forms were received during the Part 2 period, and describes those who sent them as "Part 2 respondents". Of those 33, one submitted a new response and four of the five telephoned said they did not wish to change. If those 33 sit inside the figure of 138, then roughly **one in four of the supposedly informed responses was in fact given on the superseded information.** The report does not state how they were counted. Officers should be asked to say plainly, and to give the Part 2 figures with those responses stripped out.

4 Among Alston Moor's own residents, the preferred option did not lead

Table 7, at report page 17, breaks the preferences down by category of respondent. It contains a finding the report never draws out. Of the 180 responses from Alston or Alston Moor residents:

Preference of Alston Moor residents (n=180)	Responses
Options 1, 2 and 3 — care stays on the Grisedale Croft site	87 (6 + 75 + 6)
Option 5 — alternative accommodation elsewhere in Alston	82
Option 4 — close with no replacement	1
Other	10

The same table shows that of the seven responses from a relative or friend of a resident, **five — 71 per cent — chose refurbishment**, and that all four responses from outside Alston Moor chose Option 5. Table 6 records that **not one of the 199 responses came from a resident of Grisedale Croft**.

We do not suggest that any one of these cuts of the data is decisive on its own. We say that the report presents the single number most favourable to the authority's preferred option — 48 per cent overall — and presents no other, when its own tables contain at least three readings on which that option does not lead.

5 The arithmetic has not been checked

We have added every column in the quantitative section. Three statements are wrong.

Where	What it says	What the figures actually give
Table 7 report page 17	Total row: Option 5 = 96, Other = 10	95 and 11 , which is what Tables 1 and 5 give. The percentages printed beside them — 48% and 5.5% — are the percentages for 95 and 11, so the table contradicts itself. The two errors cancel out to 199, and the table appears sound unless each column is added separately.
Table 2 report page 15	"Preference with comments" total = 171	169 . Worse, the two columns of Table 2 together account for only 197 of the 199 responses : 94 against Table 1's 95 on Option 5, and 10 against 11 on Other. Two responses are missing from the table altogether, and every percentage in the column is calculated on 171.
Age data report page 18	"93% were aged 45 or above"	94 per cent . The figures given are 174 of 185.

Alongside these, the report has **no Table 8**, and gives **two different tables the number Table 10**, at report pages 18 and 19. Report page 8 states that respondents were asked to choose "from the four options Cabinet decided to consult on"; there were five, as report pages 14 and 21 confirm. The Applethwaite Green report carries the same faults in its own way — a heading for a Table 8 with nothing beneath it, at Applethwaite report page 19, two tables numbered Table 10, and an age statement of 85 per cent where the figures give 84.

WHAT WE DRAW FROM THIS, AND WHAT WE DO NOT

We do not suggest these errors change the overall totals to any material degree, and we do not rest our case on them. We say this: **a Committee invited to take comfort from these tables is entitled to know that they contain errors that a single pass with a calculator would have caught** — and to ask what else in a 138-page pack was not checked, by whom, and when. The Applethwaite Green report's equivalent tables all reconcile exactly. Ours do not.

6 There is not one financial figure in the whole document

The report identifies confidence in the evidence base as one of its twelve themes and one of its ten key messages. It records that occupancy figures, referral pathways, refurbishment costs, demand assumptions and financial information were all subject to extensive scrutiny. Theme 7 runs to four pages on precisely this.

It then reproduces none of it. **In the fifty-six pages of the consultation report and the three pages of the covering report before it, there is no occupancy figure, no cost figure, no referral data, and not a single pound sign.** The only numbers anywhere in the document about the home itself are those quoted from this Parish Council's own submission. The Committee is told at length that the evidence was disputed, and is given no means whatever of examining it.

The contrast with the companion report is stark. The Applethwaite Green report gives the refurbishment estimate, gives the self-funder income, and states what the disclosed information showed. We return to this at Part B.

7 The ten key messages contain no numbers at all

The report closes, at report pages 55 and 56, with a "Summary of key messages from the consultation" — ten numbered findings. These are the paragraphs most likely to be read by a busy decision-maker. Not one of them contains a figure. None records that refurbishment led in the informed phase; that no resident of the home responded; that one response in 199 supported closure; or that the response rate was about ten per cent of the entire population of Alston Moor, children included — 2,088 at the last census. The Applethwaite Green report's equivalent list states its outcome plainly at its key message 5: **"Refurbishment was the preferred option."** Ours states no outcome at all.

8 Neither strand of the analysis produces a countable measure of what people wanted

Report page 14 records, in the authority's own words, that the online survey

"did not allow for respondents to select none of the five options, or choose multiple options ... Many respondents selected one of the options but then wrote in the free-text field that this did not satisfactorily reflect their view."

That is an admission that the instrument used to measure public opinion was not capable of recording it. The second Gunning principle requires consultees to be given a proper opportunity to respond; a forced choice between five options, none of which a respondent may support, is not such an opportunity. The authority's remedy was to record those responses as "Other", which places them in a category of 11 and removes them from the comparison between the options altogether.

The qualitative strand does not fill the gap. Report page 20 states that the analysis "focused primarily on the content, strength and consistency of views expressed rather than counting the frequency of individual comments", and that responses were "analysed and themed with the assistance of AI software". A note at report page 56 confirms that the document "contains thematic analysis generated by Artificial Intelligence (AI)", reviewed by the author, who takes responsibility for the content.

We make no objection to the use of such tools and we accept that the author takes responsibility. We draw the Committee's attention to what follows in combination. **The quantitative strand rests on a survey the authority says could not record what people meant; the qualitative strand does not count how many people said a thing.** Between the two there is no published, checkable measure of the weight of local opinion, and the judgement about which views were strong and consistent was formed with software whose working is not disclosed. On the authority's own account, a view held by two hundred people and a view held by two carry the same weight in the analysis that goes to Cabinet.

PART B

Two consultations, two standards: the comparison with Applethwaite Green

Agenda items 6 and 7 carry the same report author, were published the same evening, and concern two Westmorland and Furness Council homes consulted on over the same fourteen weeks under the same Cabinet decision. That makes the

differences between them evidence in themselves. We set them out in a single table and then take the three that matter most.

	Grisedale Croft, Alston	Applethwaite Green, Windermere
Options consulted on	Five, including relocation to an alternative building	Four. No relocation option was offered
Preferred option named	Yes — Option 5, named by Cabinet in April and still named on the live consultation page	No. The page states "No decisions have been taken about the final outcome"
Community alternative proposal	Recorded as "Other" — 11 responses, no theme, no name, no appendix	Named "Option 1.5", given its own row in every table, its own theme, its own key message and its own appendix
Outcome stated in key messages	No outcome stated	"Refurbishment was the preferred option"
Financial figures given	None	Refurbishment estimate, self-funder income, and a finding on the costing method
Member of Parliament	Correspondence received and published on the portal; not mentioned in the report	Named subsection, four mentions, quoted
Healthwatch	40 people engaged; summary states no findings of its own	17 people engaged; summary states specific findings
Tables reconcile	No — Tables 2 and 7 do not	Yes — every table adds up
Committee's feedback	" can be included in the decision paper for Cabinet"	" will be included in the decision paper for Cabinet"
Response rate	Approximately 10% of the population	1.8% of the population of the two wards

9 Only Alston Moor was given an answer in advance

The Grisedale Croft report records at report page 3 that Cabinet authorised a formal public consultation on five options, with Option 5 "to be indicated as the Cabinet's preferred option". The Applethwaite Green report records at Applethwaite report page 3 that Cabinet "authorised a formal public consultation on four options" — and stops there. No preference.

That was not an oversight. The Applethwaite Green report itself explains, at Applethwaite report page 49, that respondents there had seen

"the April Cabinet paper, disclosed in May under Freedom of Information, showing that closure had been identified as a preferred option in Cabinet documentation before Cabinet subsequently decided to consult on all four options without expressing a public preference."

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THAT SENTENCE

At the same meeting, on the same day, Westmorland and Furness Council held an internal preference for both homes. For Windermere it decided **not to express that preference publicly**, and consulted on four options with the outcome open. For Alston Moor it printed its preference on the consultation, on the survey, in the press release and on the website, where it remains today. **The authority understood the risk that stating a preference would compromise the consultation, took the precaution in one community, and did not take it in ours.**

The preference is not historic. The authority's consultation page for Grisedale Croft states, as at 17 September 2026:

"The council's Cabinet has already recognised that Alston is an isolated community with little alternative provision available, so for this consultation it has indicated from the outset that its preferred option is to provide alternative accommodation in a suitable building in Alston, if one could be acquired, and it is financially viable."

Two things follow. First, "from the outset" is the authority's own characterisation, not ours. Second, that sentence contains a condition — **"and it is financially viable"** — which appears nowhere in the five options as they were put to the public. The option consultees were asked to choose already carried one escape clause, "if one could be acquired". The authority's own page carries two.

10 The same alternative proposal was elevated in one community and filed under "Other" in ours

At Applethwaite Green, respondents who wanted phased refurbishment with residents staying in place produced a proposal that the report names "Option 1.5". The report gives it a row in Tables 1, 5 and 7, a theme of its own (Theme 11, four pages), its own key message, and an appendix containing the full submission — although only 15 respondents selected it. The report goes out of its way to say that "support for its underlying principles appeared substantially more widespread".

Respondents to the Grisedale Croft consultation made the identical proposal. The report quotes them, at report page 40:

"If you refurbished the attached flats at Grisedale Croft first, the current residents could remain where they are until stage one was completed ... They would still have access to the gardens and be in familiar surroundings."

"There is no need to have a temporary closure of the home for refurbishment. Refurb the empty flats upstairs to accommodate the residents, move them in there, then do a refurb on the 'home' end. All staff keep their jobs and residents stay happy."

That proposal was not named, not counted, not themed and not appended. Responses that did not fit the five options were recorded as "Other" and disappeared into a category of eleven. **The same idea, in the same month, in two reports built to the same template: a formal option at Windermere, an unclassified remainder at Alston.** We ask the Committee to require officers to explain the difference.

11 The refurbishment cost is the same figure for two different buildings

The Equality Impact Assessment of 2 July 2026 and the April Cabinet report describe Grisedale Croft as "functionally obsolete" and put modernisation at **£2.5 million to £3.0 million**. Applethwaite report page 47 records that at Windermere "Many respondents challenged the estimated refurbishment cost of **£2.5m to £3.0m**".

It is the same estimate, to the same two decimal points, for two buildings of different size and construction fifty miles apart. In answer to Freedom of Information request 208440 of 22 May 2026, the authority confirmed that it does not hold a building condition survey, a stock condition report, or any engineers' or architects' assessment of whether Grisedale Croft can be refurbished or extended. The answer was "Information not held". The report itself records a respondent's observation at report page 38: *"No actual independent survey of the current building appears to have been undertaken."* Another, at report page 37, writes as a builder: *"I am at a loss as to where you get your figures from. They seem designed more to steer people towards your preferred option, than to give a realistic idea of actual costs."*

A CENTRAL PLANK OF THE CASE, WITH NOTHING UNDER IT

The proposition that Grisedale Croft cannot viably continue rests on a cost estimate which the companion report shows to be a generic figure applied to more than one building, and which the authority has confirmed is supported by no survey of this building. **No decision to close a fifty-year-old home rated "Good" should be taken on a figure that was never about that home.**

12 The authority's own report states that its costing method was incomplete

The introduction to both reports asserts "declining occupancy rates, leading to very high costs per person". At Applethwaite report page 47, the authority's own report states, as fact and not as a respondent's claim:

"Information disclosed during the consultation confirmed that self-funder income had not been included in the published cost-per-resident calculations and that consultation materials were based on gross operating costs rather than net costs after resident contributions."

The community group at Windermere is quoted as concluding that "The Council's responses now confirm that the financial case presented to consultees was based on materially incomplete information".

The cost-per-person claim made about Grisedale Croft is the same claim, produced by the same finance function, in the same Cabinet report, in the same words. If the method excluded resident contributions and used gross rather than net costs at Windermere, the Committee should not assume it did otherwise at Alston — and the Grisedale Croft report contains no figure that would allow anyone to check. **We ask the Committee to require the net cost of Grisedale Croft, after resident contributions, for each of the last five years, before any decision is taken.**

We note one further asymmetry. The report that "does not attempt to determine the accuracy of claims" is willing to state what disclosed information "confirmed" when the subject is Applethwaite Green. It states nothing of the kind anywhere in the Grisedale Croft report.

13 Two Members of Parliament made representations on Grisedale Croft, and neither appears in the report

The Applethwaite Green report contains a named subsection, "Representations made through Tim Farron MP", summarising his correspondence and quoting from it. The Grisedale Croft report mentions no Member of Parliament at all. It lists "representations through elected representatives" at report page 4 as a source of additional evidence, and then records nothing that any elected representative said.

That is not because no such representations were made.

- ▶ **Markus Campbell-Savours MP**, the Member for Penrith and Solway, corresponded with the authority. Its own consultation portal published, on 16 September 2026, a document titled "Correspondence from Markus Campbell-Savours MP". It is on the portal. It is not in the report, and it is not in the Committee's papers.
- ▶ **Tim Farron MP**, the Member for Westmorland and Lonsdale, exchanged a series of emails with Alston Moor Parish Council about Grisedale Croft and wrote to members of Cabinet in support of retaining care provision here. Alston Moor Parish Council holds that correspondence and will supply it to the Committee.

So the same Member of Parliament is summarised and quoted at length in the report at agenda item 7, and his support for Grisedale Croft appears nowhere in the report at agenda item 6 — in the same pack, published the same evening.

14 Forty people spoke to Healthwatch on Alston Moor, and the report records no finding from them

Healthwatch Westmorland and Furness was commissioned by the authority for both consultations. It engaged 40 people on Alston Moor and 17 at Applethwaite Green. The Applethwaite Green summary, at Applethwaite report page 68, reports substantive findings, including that participants "frequently expressed concern about the clarity of information provided, changes made during the consultation period and **perceptions that closure had already become the preferred outcome**", and that there was "strong support for retaining local care provision".

The Grisedale Croft summary, at report page 54, reports no finding of its own. It says only that the themes "broadly reflected those identified through the wider consultation process" and lists them generically. **More than twice as many people took part in the engagement on Alston Moor, and their views produce a paragraph of generalities.** Neither

underlying report is in the Committee's papers, so members cannot test either summary against the document it purports to summarise.

15 The attendance sentence is identical in both reports

Report page 9 records the six drop-in events on Alston Moor:

"These events were attended by between 10 and 25 people, many of whom attended multiple sessions. The initial meeting had the most attendees ... with some attendees speaking and some attendees observing. In order to ensure all voices could be heard later events were managed differently ... These events were lower in attendance. Some people expressed that they did not wish to have drop-in sessions but preferred the format of the initial session."

Applethwaite report page 10 records six events in the Central Lakes in the same words — "attended by between 10 and 25 people, many of whom attended multiple sessions", and the rest of the passage identically, save for one clause.

WHAT THIS MEANS FOR THE FIGURE

A single range, expressed in a single sentence, is applied to twelve separate events held in two communities fifty miles apart over two months. **It cannot be a record of attendance at either set of events**, because it is not a record at all — it is a form of words. That matters, because the same figure is what tells this Committee how many people came to the events on Alston Moor, and the Parish Council's account of what actually happened is set out at section 20 below.

16 The staff of one home divided seven to one; the staff of ours were unanimous

The two reports record staff engagement in the same words. Report page 7 states that "Senior management have been present at the home during the consultation period, attending some staff meetings and also answering questions and listening to concerns from staff. Some staff have also submitted anonymised consultation survey responses expressing their views." Applethwaite report page 8 says the same. Neither report describes any structured consultation of staff, gives the size of either workforce, or records anything said at any staff meeting. Former staff are not mentioned in the Grisedale Croft report at all.

The outcomes could hardly be more different.

Responses from staff of the home	Grisedale Croft	Applethwaite Green
Number responding	4	8
Preference recorded	4 of 4 for the authority's preferred option (report page 18: "the Grisedale Croft staff who responded all preferred Option 5")	7 of 8 for refurbishment (Applethwaite report page 18: staff "nearly all preferred Refurbishment")

We draw no conclusion from that, and we do not suggest that any member of staff answered otherwise than honestly. We say that a unanimous staff vote for the employer's preferred option, in the one home where the employer had announced that preference in advance, is the kind of result a consultation report ought to examine rather than record in a single line — particularly when the report contains no account of how staff were consulted, nothing said at any staff meeting, nothing at all from former staff, and when the matter set out in Part F below is unresolved.

17 First principle — the proposal was not at a formative stage

The Cabinet report of 21 April 2026, a month before the consultation opened on 14 May, names the authority's choice and rejects the rest. Option 5 is marked the preferred option. Every other option is marked "not recommended": do nothing, refurbishment, rebuild, and closure with no alternative in Alston. The report calls Option 5 "the only option that balances resident safety, regulatory compliance, financial responsibility, strategic direction, and community needs."

A local authority is entitled to state a preferred option, provided it keeps an open mind. Entering a consultation with one preferred option and every alternative already marked as rejected — and declining to do the same thing for the other home consulted on at the same meeting — raises a serious question about whether the outcome was ever genuinely open.

The report records that the question was put at the public meeting, and records the authority's answer at report page 38: the authority "maintained that no final decision had been made and that **purchasing a property before the consultation ended would predetermine the outcome**". We invite the Committee to weigh that answer against what had already been done. On the authority's own reasoning, buying a building in advance would predetermine the outcome; naming the option, rejecting the alternatives in writing, and publishing the preference on every page apparently did not.

The report also records, at report page 39, a respondent's observation which it does not answer:

"It 'feels' to the public, with some justification, that a solution has been identified around which an option appraisal process has been constructed."

18 Second principle — consultees were not given enough information to respond intelligently

The preferred option had no site, no plan, no cost, no timetable and no funding. In answer to Freedom of Information request 208440 of 22 May 2026, the authority confirmed that for its own preferred option it holds no recorded information:

- ▶ no feasibility study, site-search report or options appraisal;
- ▶ no correspondence with potential site owners;
- ▶ no defined search radius, and no sites considered;
- ▶ no cost estimates and no delivery timetable;
- ▶ no identified source of capital funding;
- ▶ no correspondence with Homes England, the Department of Health and Social Care or any NHS body about capital funding for replacement provision on Alston Moor.

The report itself concedes the consequence. Its executive summary, at report page 4, explains the fall in support for Option 5 as owing in part to "**the lack of further information during the consultation on the possible location of Option 5**". The authority is recording, in its own executive summary, that it never told consultees where the replacement home would be — and then treating the resulting responses as a measure of informed opinion.

The authority's own April Cabinet report rejects Option 4, closure with no alternative in Alston, because "Distance to alternative homes is excessive" and it would remove "the only local provision". Yet the preferred alternative has nothing behind it, and is expressed conditionally twice over. **If no suitable building is found, or none is found that the authority judges financially viable, Alston Moor is left with precisely the option the authority itself describes as unacceptable** — and by then the home will have closed and the residents will have gone.

The building case rests on no survey. As set out at section 11 above, the authority holds no condition survey and the cost figure is generic.

The authority's documents contradict one another on the central question of local alternatives.

Document	What it says
Equality Impact Assessment 2 July 2026	"Alternative provision exists in the local area."
Cabinet report 21 April 2026	Rejects closure-with-no-alternative because "Distance to alternative homes is excessive"; describes Grisedale Croft as "the only local provision".
Consultation portal live at 17 September 2026	"Alston is an isolated community with little alternative provision available. "

These cannot all be true. The Equality Impact Assessment relies on the first of them to argue that the impact of change is reduced — and it is the Equality Impact Assessment that will be relied upon to discharge the duty under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

Low occupancy is relied upon while the routes into the home are restricted. The authority's own Questions and Answers document of 15 June 2026 explains that the referral pathway into Grisedale Croft is led by general practice and that hospital discharge teams "do not have access to this pathway", and that Alston patients discharged from hospital may instead be referred to intermediate care beds commissioned by Cumberland Council. Of 104 potential NHS short-stay bed weeks in 2025/26, only 20 were used. The report records the community's experience of this at report page 36: *"I tried to find out about the possibility of my wife entering Grisedale for care and was told that it wasn't taking people in."*

19 Third principle — the time allowed did not match the information given

The consultation itself ran fourteen weeks, and we do not say that period was too short in the abstract. We say the time was not adequate for what was asked of consultees, for three reasons.

First, the information that mattered arrived late. The material change — that refurbishment and rebuild each mean the home closing and residents moving out, for twelve to twenty-four months and two to four years respectively — was published on 26 June, six weeks into a fourteen-week consultation, with a two-week extension. Of the 61 people who had already responded, exactly one submitted a revised response.

Second, two of the six drop-in events — the only two held outside Alston town, at The Hive in Nenthead and at Garrigill Village Hall — took place on **Friday 26 June**, the very day the authority accepts its consultation information was materially inadequate and replaced it. Nenthead and Garrigill had one session each, and it fell on that day. The report does not state which version of the information was given out at them.

Third, the papers for this meeting were published late, and the public had to work around it. The agenda and reports are required to be published at least five clear working days before the meeting, which for a meeting on 23 September means by the end of Tuesday 15 September. The agenda appeared on 16 September and the reports did not appear with it — both consultation items were marked only "Report and appendices to follow". The reports were published at **21.13 and 21.20 on the evening of Wednesday 16 September**, according to the authority's own file names. The deadline for public questions and statements was extended in consequence, and the agenda now records it as 11.59pm on Friday 18 September, although it gives the year as 2025. The ordinary petition route, which requires nine working days, had closed before the reports existed.

WHAT THAT MEANT IN PRACTICE

Members of the public had one working day and a weekend to read a 138-page pack before their own right to address this Committee closed. **The Committee's papers, the consultation report and the reply to it were all produced inside seventy-two hours.** We do not think that is what the fourth Gunning principle contemplates, and we say it plainly: this submission is shorter and rougher than it would have been had the authority met its own timetable.

20 Fourth principle — the product of the consultation was not conscientiously captured

People at the drop-in events were told their views would be recorded and included. They were not. Report page 10 states:

"Drop-in events were used by officers to communicate the same information as contained in the consultation materials, and to encourage people to express their views and concerns via the online or paper survey forms. For this reason, comments expressed at the drop-ins were not captured and fed into the consultation response process."

Three things sit against that sentence.

- ▶ **Attendees were given the opposite assurance.** People who came to the sessions were told that the views they expressed would be considered and would be included in the consultation report. That has not happened, and nothing in the report acknowledges that the assurance was given.
- ▶ **Officers were seen taking notes.** Members of Alston Moor Parish Council present at the sessions saw officers of Westmorland and Furness Council writing down what was said. If notes were taken, the comments were captured. **No note from any of the six sessions has been produced, and nothing from them appears in the report.**
- ▶ **A report of the sessions was promised to the Parish Clerk and never arrived.**

And the executive summary, at report page 4, lists "a public meeting and drop-in events" among the sources through which "Additional evidence was received". **Both statements cannot be right.** Either the drop-ins produced evidence, in which case it should be before this Committee, or they produced none, in which case the executive summary should not list them as a source of evidence.

We ask the Committee to require officers to produce every note or record made by an officer at any of the six drop-in events, and to say what became of the report promised to the Parish Clerk.

The attendance figures do not match what happened. Members of Alston Moor Parish Council were present at these events. The right-hand column below is our own record.

	What the report states	What Alston Moor Parish Council records
All six drop-ins	"attended by between 10 and 25 people" (report page 9)	The range does not hold at either end.
First event Alston Library, 3 June	"The initial meeting had the most attendees, and it developed into a number of small group meetings of up to 8 people"	Well over one hundred people. The library was filled beyond its capacity, people sat on the floor in the children's area, and people who came to take part were unable to get in.
Later events	"managed differently ... lower in attendance"	Very much smaller. The session at Garrigill Village Hall drew fewer than ten.
Public meeting Alston Town Hall, 16 July	"attended by 78 members of the public" (report page 13)	The hall holds ninety-three chairs in total . Eighty were set out before the meeting and more were brought out as people arrived, until every chair the hall has was in use. People were still standing in the doorway, around the edge of the room, and on the landing outside, listening in.

The chair count is the load-bearing fact here, and it is checkable. Alston Town Hall holds ninety-three chairs. Every one of them was in use and people were still standing in three separate places. **The attendance was therefore materially greater than ninety-three, and it cannot have been seventy-eight.**

We ask the Committee to require officers to produce the attendance record kept for each of the six drop-in events and for the public meeting, and to explain the method by which the figure of 78 was arrived at. We say that these are two separate events at which the attendance recorded is materially lower than what took place, in each case in the direction

of making public engagement appear smaller than it was, and that the Committee should treat that as a pattern rather than as two isolated slips.

THE GRAVER POINT

The largest single gathering of this entire consultation produced no record whatsoever. The people who filled Alston Library on 3 June — many of them elderly, many of whom would never complete an online form, and some of whom could not get through the door — were told in effect that turning up was not a way of being heard. **Views that nobody wrote down cannot be conscientiously taken into account by anybody.**

The people most affected are outside the analysis. Table 6 records that not one of the 199 responses came from a resident of Grisedale Croft. Residents' own views exist only in the N-Compass advocacy report, which the consultation report itself describes at report page 54 as "the principal independent record of resident views" — and which, with the Healthwatch report, was deliberately kept out of the authority's thematic analysis, at report pages 19 and 54, in order to preserve independence and avoid double-counting. Whatever the intention, the effect is that **the residents of the home are absent from the analysis that goes to Cabinet.** Neither report is in the Committee's papers. Only summaries appear, while the covering report lists "Appendices (if any)" as "N/A" and the consultation report cross-refers to an "Appendix 2 – N-Compass report" that is not there.

We note that at Applethwaite Green five residents of the home responded to the survey directly, and 29 relatives and friends. At Grisedale Croft the figures are nil and seven. The report offers no explanation of the difference and no account of what was done to enable residents of Grisedale Croft to respond.

Twenty people who wrote in detail were excluded from the count. Report page 14 records direct responses and correspondence from 20 people, which "ranged from one-line expressions of a preference or comment to detailed submissions or lengthy correspondence", and states that these are excluded from the quantitative analysis. So the consultation in fact received 219 individual contributions, of which 199 were counted. The twenty who wrote at length rather than ticking a box are absent from every table in the report.

This Parish Council's submission counts for nothing in the figures. Report page 14 states that "There were no official responses on behalf of organisations received via the consultation survey." Alston Moor Parish Council's formal consultation response, adopted on 3 August 2026 and now published on the authority's own portal, therefore appears in no table. At Applethwaite Green, four organisational responses were received through the survey, extracted, "recorded in full in Appendix 4", and summarised in a dedicated section covering a town council, two parish councils and a primary care network. Alston Moor Parish Council speaks for the whole civil parish. In the quantitative analysis before this Committee it is worth zero.

The route from this Committee to the decision is not guaranteed. Paragraph 2.1 of the covering report, at pack page 5, asks the Committee to provide feedback "which **can** be included in the decision paper for Cabinet". Paragraph 2.1 of the Applethwaite Green report, at pack page 65, says "**will** be included". The same author gave a firmer undertaking on one home than on the other, in the same pack, and gives no reason. That wording sits alongside the authority's statement of 8 September 2026, still live on both consultation pages, that this Committee "will receive the reports on the results of the public consultations only" and "is NOT involved in the final decision-making process and will not be considering the final decision papers which will go to Cabinet".

21 The equality analysis is described to the Committee and withheld from it

Paragraph 11.1 of the covering report states that no Equality Impact Assessment has been completed for this report, and that detailed assessments will be submitted with the Cabinet paper — the paper the authority has said this Committee will not see.

Meanwhile the consultation report, at report page 52, sets out this Parish Council's specific challenge:

"The Equality Impact Assessment, as produced, does not discharge the Council's obligations under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010."

The Committee is shown the allegation and denied the document needed to test it. That is not a matter that can sensibly be left to the Cabinet paper, because this Committee is the body being asked to advise on it.

The assessment of 2 July 2026, which is on the consultation portal, records potential negative impacts across age, disability, pregnancy and maternity, rurality, socio-economic status, armed forces families and care-experienced people, including relocation, greater travel distances and disruption to established routines and relationships. It concedes that key information was "not yet gathered" — resident assessments, accessibility needs, staff impacts and stakeholder views — to be collected "before any decision is taken". It commits that all equality impact assessments "will be treated as live documents and will be continually reviewed and updated throughout the consultation process", and it sets itself a review date of **20 August 2026**.

THE PROMISED REVISION HAS NOT APPEARED

Alston Moor Parish Council put to the authority during the consultation that the assessment was inadequate and should have been completed before the consultation opened rather than seven weeks into it. We were told that a revised assessment would be produced as the consultation ran, and published at its close.

The consultation closed on 19 August. The assessment set its own review date at 20 August. It is now 18 September, and the only version published is still the one dated 2 July 2026. That is not for want of publishing activity: the authority added more than a dozen documents to the same consultation page on 16 September. No revised equality impact assessment was among them.

We do not know whether the work was done and not published, or was not done. Only officers can answer that, and we ask that they be required to. What is not in doubt is that the authority set itself a review date, passed it, and has put no revised assessment before the public or before this Committee.

The authority's own assessment accepts that the harm is real and that its evidence base was incomplete. If the decision proceeds on 13 October without the further assessments the authority promised, that is a failing on the authority's own terms.

22 Twenty-seven documents are on the portal and none is before the Committee

Section 13 of both covering reports, at pack pages 7 and 66, is headed "Background Documents" and is **blank**.

On the same day the reports were published, the authority added to its Grisedale Croft consultation portal the full anonymised survey responses, the direct correspondence, the correspondence from Markus Campbell-Savours MP, this Parish Council's formal response and correspondence, the Healthwatch report, the N-Compass advocacy report, the Equality Impact Assessment of 2 July 2026, both consultation packs, the Questions and Answers document, the April Cabinet report and a composite of the Freedom of Information disclosures. The portal now lists **twenty-seven supporting documents**.

Not one of them is in the Committee's papers, and not one of them is listed as a background document. We invite the Committee to ask why, and to consider whether the material on which these reports rely has been made available to members in the way that section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972 contemplates.

PART D

The history the report does not tell

23 The 2017–18 settlement, and why occupancy is the wrong measure

Theme 5 of the report sets out, fairly and at length, the community's case that Grisedale Croft cannot be understood in isolation from the closure of the inpatient beds at the Ruth Lancaster James Cottage Hospital. It quotes this Parish Council:

"When the inpatient beds at Alston Community Hospital were closed in 2018, there was an agreement that two 'health beds' would be available ... with full 'wraparound' care. The people of Alston Moor accepted the loss of their hospital on that basis."

And it quotes the NHS planning documents themselves:

"Two step up/step down beds will be provided in Grisedale Croft residential home ... The beds would be for short term use and would be supported by health care professionals."

It records the authority's answer at report page 31 — that the beds "were not formally commissioned as intermediate-care beds and lacked the wider wraparound support required for a modern intermediate-care service" — and then, in accordance with its stated method, determines nothing.

We say the record does not support that answer, and we ask the Committee to require officers to address these documents specifically before Cabinet:

- ▶ the **Alston Alliance Health and Care Plan**, which commits in terms to beds in the residential care home in Alston with nursing and therapy support. The plan is not mentioned anywhere in the 56-page report;
- ▶ the progress report to the **Cumbria Health Scrutiny Committee of 8 October 2018**, which records enhanced nursing support into residential care beds as delivered;
- ▶ the **Care Quality Commission inspection report of October 2018**, which rated the home "Good" in all five domains and records the registered manager's own account of the health beds and the Alston plan.

Alston Moor Parish Council holds all three and will supply them to the Committee, unredacted, on request.

A MATTER THE COMMITTEE SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THESE DOCUMENTS

We supplied this historical material to the consultation because **Westmorland and Furness Council asked us for it**. It was subsequently disclosed in answer to a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 — and a substantial part of the content came back **redacted**. So the authority sought these documents from this Parish Council, and the versions it has since released carry redactions that the originals we sent it do not.

We ask the Committee to require officers to state which exemption was relied upon for each redaction, and to put the unredacted documents before Cabinet. If it is of any help, we will supply our own clean copies at once and at no cost to the authority.

The point of the documents is short: **occupancy did not fall because need fell. It fell because the pathway that was promised was never built, and then the routes into the home were closed off**. The authority's own Questions and Answers document, quoted at section 18 above, describes the mechanism.

24 The report records the community's answer, and the authority has not engaged with it

Theme 10 of the report is, in substance, the community's alternative proposal, and it is the strongest material in the document. It records support across every respondent group for an integrated model bringing together residential care, respite, rehabilitation, intermediate care, hospital discharge support and end-of-life care, planned jointly by Westmorland and Furness Council, NHS partners and the community. It quotes a resident of Alston Moor:

"I beg you, please, before any decision is made about the future of residential care on Alston Moor stop and look at the real need and talk to the NHS about a clear pathway for the future use of such care. All relevant parties NEED to get around the table NOW before any decisions are made."

Theme 11 records the same community identifying the assets to do it with — the former cottage hospital, the empty flats at Grisedale Croft, the former primary school — and Theme 9 records it treating recruitment as a problem to be solved rather than a reason to withdraw.

The report does not record that any of this has been acted upon, or that any conversation with NHS partners has begun. **It must happen under every one of the five options, and on the papers before this Committee it has not started.**

25 The positive case, in five propositions

This submission is critical of the process, and we have set out why. But the Parish Council's position is not simply opposition, and we ask the Committee to record it.

One. The service is good and the community wants it kept. The authority's own report opens by recording that Grisedale Croft "continues to deliver high-quality care and is rated 'Good' by the Care Quality Commission", after more than fifty years serving Alston Moor. Its first key message is that "some form of residential care provision should remain on Alston Moor". Of 199 responses, one supported closure with no replacement. Approximately ten per cent of the entire population of the parish responded — more than five times the rate at Applethwaite Green — and they gave one answer.

Two. The building is capable of more, not less. It is roughly fifty years old, purpose-designed, with parking, extensive gardens and a wing of flats standing empty. Respondents quoted in the report propose refurbishing the flats first so that residents stay on site while the main building is modernised; converting the downstairs flats to staff accommodation and a therapy room to help recruitment; and enlarging rooms rather than replacing the building. These are the same phased proposals the authority elevated to a formal option at Windermere. **They have never been costed for Grisedale Croft, because no survey of the building exists.**

Three. Care at home cannot carry Alston Moor on its own. The authority's direction of travel is to support more people in their own homes for longer. On Alston Moor that ambition meets a housing stock that is largely old, much of it stone-built and a substantial part of Alston town within a designated conservation area subject to an Article 4 Direction made by Westmorland and Furness Council. Many of these houses cannot readily be adapted for hoists, wet rooms, level access or the equipment that advanced frailty and dementia require. The report records the community's experience in its own words: *"Care at home is extremely limited here", "There is no respite care here at all", and "Many people with dementia and complex needs live at home because there is nowhere appropriate for them to go."* A policy of caring for people at home until the very end, in this housing stock, does not remove the need for a local bed. It creates the need for a bed with more clinical support, not less.

Four. That points to upgrading the offer, not shrinking it. If people are to be supported at home for longer, those who then need a bed will arrive frailer and with more complex needs. That requires nursing capability, palliative capability and a working relationship with the NHS — which is precisely what the 2017–18 settlement was supposed to deliver. A four-bed replacement is the opposite of what the direction of travel implies. The report records the community saying so repeatedly, and records this Parish Council's own formulation: *"Four or five beds cannot deliver an integrated step-down model, which requires step-down capacity on top of permanent residential care, not in place of it."* What Alston Moor needs is a small, flexible bed base — a permanent care bed, a respite bed, an emergency short-stay bed, a local palliative care bed, and NHS step-down and intermediate-care beds.

Five. Distance is not a detail here. Alston Moor is among the most isolated communities in England, and the authority's own consultation page says so. The nearest towns are over twenty miles away across roads that close in winter. There is no daily public transport to any town. Many older people here no longer drive. Moving a resident off the Moor does not reduce their care; it removes the daily visit that is the substance of their life, and it transfers the burden to family carers who are mostly women, mostly older themselves, and mostly without transport. The report records a relative of a former resident: *"My sister does not have a driving licence, so being in Alston meant she was able to visit her husband every day. Had he been moved many miles away, this would simply not have been possible."*

WHAT WE ARE ASKING FOR

Keep Grisedale Croft Care Home. Survey it properly. Cost a phased refurbishment that keeps residents on site. Re-open the referral routes into the home, and sit down with the NHS to build the integrated bed base that was promised in 2017 and never delivered. **Every one of those steps is required whatever is decided about the building, and not one of them has begun.**

26 Questions we put rather than claims we make

The matters below rest on accounts given to this Parish Council which we have not been able to document from the authority's own papers. We have deliberately kept them out of Parts A to E. We put them as questions for officers, and we ask the Committee to require answers on the record before the Cabinet decision on 13 October.

Matter	The question we ask the Committee to put
Publicity for the drop-in events	On what date, and by what means, was each of the six drop-in events first publicised? We have accounts of at least two sessions of which no public notice was given and which local people learned of by chance the day before.
Which information was given out on 26 June	The Nenthead and Garrigill sessions, the only two held outside Alston town, fell on the day the consultation information was replaced. Which version of the materials was issued at them?
The telephone contact with Part 1 respondents	What script, briefing or form of words was used when the authority telephoned Part 1 respondents about the update, and will officers publish it? At least one respondent has described feeling under pressure about the response they had given.
Whether a building has been identified	Does the authority hold, or has any officer or member identified, any specific building for the preferred option? We have an account of a building being referred to at a meeting with health partners. Freedom of Information request 208440 says no sites have been considered. Both cannot be right.
Admissions to the home	Are permanent admissions to Grisedale Croft currently suspended or restricted? If so, by whose decision, on what date, and on what recorded basis? Theme 2 of the report is headed "Impact on current and future residents"; if no one can be admitted there can be no future residents.
What staff were told	Will officers publish any letter, email or briefing sent to staff of Grisedale Croft during the consultation concerning speaking publicly about it? We have an account, in terms we recall, of staff being told not to say anything that would show Westmorland and Furness Council in a bad light. We hold no copy and we make no allegation. We ask only that the question be put, and answered on the record.
Home care actually delivered	How many home care packages are commissioned on Alston Moor, and how many hours were actually delivered in the last twelve months? We have an account of commissioned care not being delivered because carers would not travel the distance.
The capital receipt	What assumption has been made about the proceeds of the Grisedale Croft site, and will any receipt be reinvested in care provision on Alston Moor?
"Special treatment"	At the public meeting on 16 July it was said, in terms we recall, that Alston Moor was receiving more favourable treatment than Windermere in being offered a fifth option. Given that Windermere alone was consulted without a preferred option, we ask officers to explain what was meant.

Net cost of the home

What is the **net** cost of Grisedale Croft, after resident contributions, for each of the last five years — the figure the Applethwaite Green report indicates was not used?

WHAT WE ASK OF THE COMMITTEE

We ask the Committee to record that, on the authority's own documents, the consultation and the reporting of it have not met the standards the law requires, and to put the following to officers.

- ▶ **First** — how did the covering report come to state a closing date that this consultation never had; what else in the report has been checked, by whom; and will a corrected report be published before Cabinet meets?
- ▶ **Second** — why was a preferred option named for Grisedale Croft and expressly not named for Applethwaite Green, when both were decided at the same Cabinet meeting?
- ▶ **Third** — will the Committee ask that the Cabinet decision of 13 October be deferred until a corrected and complete report has been published, the promised further equality impact assessments are finished, the underlying occupancy, referral and net cost figures are in the public domain, and residents have had adequate time to read and respond to them?
- ▶ **Fourth** — will the Committee require officers to publish the site, the cost, the timetable and the funding for the preferred option, or to state plainly that none yet exists; and to explain the condition "and it is financially viable" which appears on the consultation page but not in the option consulted upon?
- ▶ **Fifth** — will the Committee require a building-specific condition survey and a costed phased refurbishment option for Grisedale Croft before any decision is taken?
- ▶ **Sixth** — will the Committee ask that work with NHS partners on an integrated bed base for Alston Moor begin now, since it is required under every option and has not begun?
- ▶ **Seventh** — will the Committee amend paragraph 2.1 of its own recommendation so that its feedback **will** be included in the Cabinet paper, as it is for Applethwaite Green, and satisfy itself that twenty days is enough for that to happen?
- ▶ **Eighth** — will the Committee refer the conduct of this consultation to the authority's Monitoring Officer?

We would far rather these matters were put right by this Committee and by Cabinet than examined anywhere else. This submission is made so that the authority is in no doubt as to the matters relied upon, and as to the date on which they were raised.

Grisedale Croft Care Home matters a great deal to Alston Moor. Of 199 responses, one supported closure. When the people of this parish were given corrected information, they asked for the home to be refurbished. We ask only that the future of the home be decided by a process that is fair, lawful and open, and that the answer this community has already given be counted properly.

Sources. All documents are Westmorland and Furness Council's own. Reports pack, Health and Adults Scrutiny Committee, 23 September 2026, agenda items 6 and 7, comprising the covering reports of Cath Whalley, Strategic Director Adult Social Care, and the Grisedale Croft Consultation Report and Applethwaite Green Consultation Report, both September 2026. Cabinet report, 21 April 2026. Draft Cabinet report, 23 March 2026. Equality Impact Assessment, Grisedale Croft, 2 July 2026. Questions and Answers no 1, 15 June 2026. Consultation update email, 25 June 2026, and consultation pack 2, 26 June 2026. "A Place Called Home" engagement report, August 2026. Response to Freedom of Information request 208440, 22 May 2026. Response to Freedom of Information request 211895, consultation process. Westmorland and Furness Council statement, 8 September 2026. Grisedale Croft and Applethwaite Green consultation pages at consult.westmorlandandfurness.gov.uk, as read on 17 September 2026. Westmorland and Furness Council planning guidance, Alston Conservation Area Article 4 Direction. Population figure from the 2011 census for the civil parish of Alston Moor. Documents held by Alston Moor Parish Council and available to the Committee on request: the Alston Alliance Health and Care Plan; the progress report to the Cumbria Health Scrutiny Committee, 8 October 2018; the Care Quality Commission inspection report for Grisedale Croft, October 2018.

Submitted on behalf of Alston Moor Parish Council · Alston Town Hall, Front Street, Alston, Cumbria CA9 3RF · Tel: 01434 382076